DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 328 930 CS 507 395

AUTHOR Hughes, Loraye; Fadely, Dean
TITLE When Apologia Fails: J. Danforth Quayle and the Idea of the Absent.
PUB DATE Apr 90
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Southern States Communication Association (Birmingham, AL, April 5-8, 1990).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Communication Research; *Political Candidates; *Presidential Campaigns (United States); *Public Relations; Public Speaking; *Rhetoric
IDENTIFIERS Political Rhetoric; *Quayle (Dan); Republican Party; *Rhetorical Strategies; Vice Presidential Debates; Vice Presidents

ABSTRACT

The 1988 vice presidential campaign became a quagmire for Dan Quayle and the National Republican Party. To regain their footing and rehabilitate Quayle, the Republicans adopted two classic strategies for coping (often studied in the academy): rhetorical apologia and minimal exposure. During the campaign, an accusation was made that Quayle used his powerful family connections to gain a post in the journalism department of the National Guard to avoid active military service during the Vietnam era. The accusation was accompanied by criticisms of Quayle's poor academic record and his undistinguished Senate career. In the first stage of the Quayle campaign, it seemed every new bit of information that emerged concerning Quayle damaged the Bush-Quayle ticket. A second stage was characterized by the basic elements of rhetorical apologia: denial, bolstering, differentiation, transcendence, and minimization. In a third phase of the campaign, Quayle's handlers began to quarantine him from curious reporters and only allowed him to appear before audiences guaranteed to react favorably. George Bush appeared with his running mate only twice, and Quayle's name disappeared from bumper stickers. Quayle became the first vice presidential candidate to be gracefully removed from the ticket without being removed. (Sixty-eight notes are included.) (SG)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED328930

WHEN APOLOGIA FAILS:
J. DANFORTH QUAYLE AND THE IDEA OF THE ABSENT

by

Loraye Hughes and Dean Fadely

Division of Communication Studies

The University of North Carolina at Greensboro

Accepted for presentation as a paper at:

The 1990 Convention of:

The Southern States Communication Association

Birmingham, Alabama, U.S.A.

April 5-8, 1990

CS507395

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Loraye Hughes

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

WHEN APOLOGIA FAILS:
J. DANFORTH QUAYLE AND THE IDEA OF THE ABSENT

WHEN APOLOGIA FAILS:

J. Danforth Quayle and the Idea of the Absent

ABSTRACT

The 1988 Vice Presidential campaign became a quagmire for Dan Quayle and the National Republican Party. In order to regain their footing and rehabilitate Quayle, the Republicans adopted two strategies for coping: rhetorical apologia and minimal exposure. This paper examines the Quayle campaign and those two resultant strategies.

Part I. A Quagmire

Scandals begin as accusations--attacks on a person's conduct or character. These accusations invite defenses resulting in a "dialectical enjoinment of narratives"[1]. These two opposing stories structure reality and help the public "know". Since the "truth" is the story that is the most coherent, believable, and consistent with the public's experience, we would contend that in order to manage scandal successfully, a rhetor must deal with three issues: coherence, consistency and clarity.

First, an incoherent charge can be ignored and should be. If it is not ignored, the public becomes suspicious that, were more facts known, the charge would be coherent. Second, if the charge is inconsistent with public experience, the charge will not stick, and also should be ignored for the same reason. Third, if the charge is clearly delineated and documented (that is, coherent, believable, and consistent) it must be challenged and resolved, quickly. A counterattack of denial or refutation is demanded.

The successful refutation requires four steps: 1) Name the charge for which one is attacked. By labeling the accusation one retains control of the definition. 2) Explicate. One should explain and differentiate the circumstances, action, scenario and motives surrounding the charge. 3) Offer proof. And, 4) help the audience draw the appropriate conclusion.

An accusation against J. Danforth Quayle, Vice Presidential nominee in the 1988 campaign, was that he used the influence of powerful family connections to gain a post in the journalism department of the National Guard during the Vietnam era. The accusation stuck because it was consistent with the popular belief that wealthy families used their clout

to keep their sons out of active military combat. This accusation was difficult for Senator Quayle to refute and was carried in the media for several weeks. It ultimately chained out as a fantasy theme in ever widening circles and subjects--wealth, privilege, lack of integrity, lack of intelligence, etc.[2]

While Quayle successfully labeled the accusation about his military service in a way in which he was defended by National Guardsmen all over the country, he failed to provide a believable explanation, adequate proof or a favorable audience conclusion.[3] His handlers diverted the chaining out by complaining about Quayle's mistreatment at the hands of the media. The campaign staff was gleeful when the tables were turned on the questioners at a press conference in Quayle's hometown. A crowd of 27,000 enthusiastic supporters caught public attention, momentarily drawing scrutiny away from the National Guard controversy, replacing it with outcries against the media's rough handling of Quayle. Portraying the media as harassers, placards read: "Quayle Country: Media Poachers Beware, " "No Hunting Or Trapping - Sam Donaldson Go Home!" "We"re Proud of Our National Guard". [4]

Quayle's handlers manipulated a successful display of support at the press conference; thereby, establishing claims of abuse by the media. Such claims could chain out on partial truths and the willingness of the public to believe that the media sometimes harasses candidates. The handlers also successfully reframed the scene, resetting it in a way that bolstered Quayle's image with large, cheering, supportive crowds defending Quayle.

Scandals are usually part fact and part fiction. That is, they are made of narrative explanations (stories) based on some hard facts or a grain of truth.[5] They are fiction in that an audience's expression of themes will

chain out carrying the story into the future. Let us examine why partial truth is an asset in scandal maniuplation.

Establishing claims against someone requires enough ambiguity in the situation for these themes (fantasy images) to chain out. A typical scandal invites the public to create a drama by "completing the central enthymeme with its own suspicions and fantasies." In the adopted narrative, the public believes it has arrived at a rational claim based on data and warrants. The public functions as judge and jury.[6] Some individuals can more skillfully determine which public narrative will prevail than others. For example, Ronald Reagan successfully took charge of, and countermanded, the chaining out when he appointed a blue-ribbon commission to answer the Iran-Contra charges for him.[7]

Dan Quayle lacked the skill to do the same. Even stories about his wife embarrassed him politically when she was described as leading him with nonverbal cues through interviews with the press.[8] The chaining out exploded into popularity because everyone loves a funny story. The humor of the story made it very popular, reinforcing Quayle's negative image as a "bimbo".

In managing rhetoric reqarding Quayle's service record, Quayle's handlers made some wise decisions. Instead of allowing Vietnam war veterans to control the chaining out, the Quayle team chose a different jury - the National Guardsmen who have proudly served their country. The Guardsmen seemed to jump quickly to save Quayle's image with the view that service in the National Guard is honorable and was in the '60's. Further criticism by the media would have alienated millions and cast aspersions on their choice of service. That the story was damaging, there is no question. The media had said so much about Vietnam, they were becoming enmeshed in a battle with the Guard over the morality of the war (by dredging up many unresolved issues from times past).

Both Time and Newsweek ran extensive stories about Dan Quayle's military record in their August 29 and September 4 issues. On September 29 Newsweek used the story of Quayle's military record in its article "Who Is Dan Quayle?" followed on the next page by "A Media Feeding Frenzy" (a refutation answering charges that the press had gone too far on Quayle), and then by an article on "The Political Specter of Vietnam." Since the debate over Vietnam was never really settled, Quayle's quandary brought back unresolved tensions requarding highly complex yet emotional issues. This took the public focus off Iran-Contra which could have drawn equally as much or more attention. People were mesmerized by the Quayle controversy because no one knew him, because they were familiar with the themes of wealth and privilege, and because they were curious about the broadening specter of scandal. The public's attention was glued to Quayle as a mystery candidate. Was his service in the National Guard a Vietnam dodge? Was his hawkish position on Vietnam and his safe role in fighting the war (through rhetoric) a mark of hypocrisy?[9]

Service in Vietnam was a great test for that era's baby-boomers. If the quandary over Quayle's nomination is an example, people of his age group will be required to make a public assessment of their military service anytime they run for public office at the national level. Well-born politicians who escaped service in Vietnam should, according to Bob Kierey (Vietnam vet and governor of Nebraska), at least "understand that...wealth and privilege enabled [them] to do things that other people weren't able to do." [10] They should also understand public resentment and Vietnam veterans' outrage.

Quayle's response further escalated the public reaction-reopening old wounds. Rather than giving a credible answer Quayle responded, "My desire

was to continue to law school."[11] His statement failed to reach the believability standard for appropriate response to public scandal. Even if it was true, it is not proof enough because its superficiality carries an element of denial (that he may have wanted to also avoid combat). Besides its moral magnitude is not adequately focused. People wanted moral insight into his character. He gave a practical but limp answer, missing the moral question and raising the further question of his intellectual depth.

If this were not damaging enough, consider a comment Quayle made at an informational press conference held by the Republican ticket. When a reporter asked why he chose to go into the National Guard rather than serve in Vietnam, Quayle responded: "...I did not know in 1969 that I would be in this room today, I confess."[12] Does this mean he would have gone into the Marines like his brother ? How sincere would his patriotism have been if he served in combat only because he knew he would run for Vice President one day? What kind of a person would admit this?

Time also gave extensive play to Quayle's service record. In "Greetings, You Have Been Selected," Jacob Lamar wrote: "The controversy over Senator Quayle's military service has recalled one of the shabbier aspects of American involvement in Vietnam." The Quayle nomination brought back painful memories of those who died in Vietnam, questions over the purpose of the war, the shame of those who burned their draft cards or fled to Canada, the morality of Americans who served or chose not to serve in the most unpopular war in history.[13]

More troubling were his lapses of memory reqarding whether or not phone calls had been made to get him into the Guard.[14] His incredible assertion that he was not trying to avoid combat reflected his clumsy inexperience on the national front pages, depicting him as inexperienced, totally unprepared for national scrutiny, and quite a lightweight.

Walter Shapiro, in the same issue of Time, writes, " An iron law of scandal is that no matter how grave or trivial the offense, the press will inevitably reduce the issue to a simple question of honesty."[15] Quayle failed to see that. He never publicly acknowledged any dispersion on his character. His response was a shading of the truth; was it his desire to continue in school?

Especially damaging to his military story's credibility was the story that he used influence to gain acceptance in law school. If he used influence in one arena, why wouldn't he in another? After investigation, news services reported he had been a poor student as an undergraduate and that his family made a large donation to the law school where he was finally granted admittance. [16]

Had he a burning desire to go to law school exemplified by academic potential in undergraduate school and superior grades in law school, the public would have been more willing to believe his scholarly interest. Why else would a war hawk join the Guard? However, he was described by his teachers as vapid and a political science professor said he had an "ostentatious indifference to academics."[17] Quayle was a golf star in law school, and Quayle himself admitted a mere C average.

> What probably reveals the truth more than anything is that: From the first moment, when questions about his service were raised at the Republican Convention, he seemed surprised and puzzled at the concern. It was as if he had never thought about why some men fought in Vietnam and others did not. It is staggering that someone from the Vietnam era would not have opened his mind even a little to that consuming question. [18]

The stories of Quayle's military record and his family connections became inexorably enmeshed with stories of his academic record and

family connections, reinforcing public belief that he received favors, that his wealth and family entitled him to privileges ordinary Americans do not have. He handled questions about his academic record poorly by stonewalling reporters who implored him to be open and honest. Anthony Lewis complained, "Academic records are usually kept secret for reasons of privacy. But privacy has to yield when there are relevant questions about a candidate's capacity to hold the highest office in this country."[19]

DePauw has a policy which requires all students to pass an examination in their areas of major study in order to be graduated. Rarely does anyone fail; Quayle did. He was given another test and passed. Did he get special treatment? If so, why?[20] Quayle did not take a political science course required by all other political science majors in his department. Was it waived? Was another course substituted? How did Quayle avoid the requirement?[21] The questions continued, as does Lewis' complaint:

> Bad grades should not condemn anyone. A familiar example is Winston Churchill who did badly at Harrow. Churchill never attempted to conceal his record but tried to rise above it...If Senator Quayle was candid about his academic failings, if he had gone on from them to display emerging intellect and character, it would be different. But he's the opposite of candid and his Senate colleagues view him as a lightweight. His dogged concealment of the facts raises legitimate questions. What is he hiding?[22]

Bush trumpeted his vice-presidential running mate as a model by which his fitness for the White House should be judged. The Quayle selection seriously called Bush's decision-making ability into question.

Not only was Quayle's military record a major issue, the controversy chained out (as we have said before) to include his college academic

career, his intelligence, his moral fiber, his patriotism, and on and on.... It was clear Quayle was not prepared for national media contact. For example, "Quayle's hyperactive performance" at the convention "upon his own investiture was criticized by many as more appropriate for a gameshow host than for a would-be Vice President." It seems "he bounded across the podium, waving his arms, grabbing Bush's shoulders (to which the Vice President recoiled) and shouting meaningless phrases like "Go get'em!" [23]

Further, Quayle's career in the Senate had been undistinguished: "Senate colleagues are generally charitable, but few describe him as either a legislative or intellectual heavyweight." Instead his colleagues depict him as a "genial and likable underachiever who plays a great game of golf."[24]

Quayle's probable virtue to Bush, insofar as his Senate career was concerned, was that Quayle had left "too light an imprint to arouse enemies." The only piece of legislation he could claim in eight years was his sponsorhip, with Ted Kennedy, of the 1982 Job Training and Partnership Act. [25]

Walter Shapiro wrote, "In a vice presidential candidate, the nation sees an individual who can be called on to enter the Oval Office at a time of supreme national anguish. That is the unfortunate thing about the Quayle quagmire - how little of the controversy touches on the Indiana Senator's abilities to shoulder that potential terrible burden."[27]

In Booneville, Missouri, when he was asked about his qualifications to be President, Mr. Quayle cited his initiatives in eight years on the Senate Armed Services Committee. He said:

> I got through a number of things in the area of defense. Like showing the importance of cruise missiles and getting them more accurate so that we can have precise precision [sic].[28]

Is this rhetoric of a potential President?

Besides his Congressional record Quayle claimed other qualifications. He said, "When I was going to law school at night, I worked in state government in the governor's office."[29] Is this elitest "go'fer" experience worthy of a President? He further noted that he had met a payroll for the Huntington Herald Press - a paper owned by his father.[30]

Angry signs appeared in this particular Missouri crowd: "It isn't the skeleton in the closet but the brain in the head " and " "Sissy Rich Boy " underscoring two major problems for Quayle.[31]

It seems ironic that Dan Quayle, as a young law student interested in politics, would describe a 1972 movie The Candidate as a subject of great fascination. A law school classmate said he frequently referred to the movie and discussed it with his friends. The caustic movie starring Quayle's look alike, Robert Redford, is about a politician totally lacking in substance. His only qualifications were his good looks and charm.[32]

The public reaction to Quayle was a hugh embarrassment to the Bush campaign, since it called Bush's decision-making ability into serious question, as we said earlier. The fact that Bush took secrecy over consensus in choosing a running mate was hard for his aides to understand. "Aides concede[d] that he used a process that bothered them, and one that is uncharacteristic of the Vice President's usual habit of relying heavily on advisers." Mr. Bush did not allow his top political advisers to examine and weigh information being collected.[33] With this being the case, the campaign staff should not have treated Quayle as a normal candidate, employing the usual campaign rhetorical strategies.

Campaign rhetoric can be viewed as consisting of three basic message strategies: 1) bolstering - to promote the positive attributes of the candidates or issues, 2) attack messages - noting the shortcomings of the opponent's character, record, issue statements, and 3) refutation

messages - designed to answer an opponent's attacks.[34]

In this campaign it was difficult to bolster Quayle's image. Repeated attempts failed. As far as attack messages go, Quayle was not artful enough to lay the blade to the Dukakis ticket. It was dangerous to trust Quayle to repeat handler-devised attack messages since he muddled them, picked inappropriate times to state them, and spoke them out of context. Most of the attack messages against Quayle by the Dukakis ticket were so accurate that there was no adequate means of refutation. To a large extent, the Dukakis team let Quayle hang himself. The Dukakis team could have and, perhaps should have, been much harder on him, emphasizing his every gaffe, pointing out his blunders, ridiculing Quayle's near daily mishaps and, all the while hammering away the message that were Bush to be elected, J. Danforth Quayle would be but a heart beat away.

Part II: Coping

How did the Bush campaign advisers save the ticket? What strategies were employed to limit the damage?

Quayle's campaign was composed of three stages. The second two were a response to the first. Stage one was the Quayle scrutiny stage, two was that of rhetorical apologia, and the third is best represented by Foucault's "idea of the absent."

The first stage represented the time from the evening Quayle was named as the Vice Presidential running mate through the end of the month. This was the " Quayle choice under glass," actually the "horrification" stage. The choice, and the manner of the choice, became more and more horrifying as more scrutiny was given to the, at first, anonymous Quayle. It seemed every new bit of information that emerged damaged the ticket. Everytime Quayle spoke, his words seemed to cause more trouble. In

Chicago, he "abandoned his carefully crafted text and delivered an often rambling address that left his audience shaking their heads in confusion and his staff dismayed. At one point he even used a Tom Clancy novel, Red Storm Rising, as justification for the building of a weapon to destroy satellites in space.[35] In Newnan, Georgia, Quayle was critical of the way the "bureaucracy impedes development of farmer exports." He said, "The U. S. fails to help exporters win foreign markets for their products." When quizzed by the press about what products, he could not name one. He contended, "This is due to a cultural environment within the state department." Blaming career diplomats he said, "The Bush-Quayle administration will not allow this perception." The media criticized him for his lack of details on general issues. Later in the day, after he had had time to think about it, Quayle suggested: "Wheat flour to Egypt?"[36]

In various speeches and press conferences across the country he confused defense and offense (not being able to discriminate a difference), showed total ignorance of the John Barnette case of 1943 (although a lawyer), did not know the Vice President handled Ronald Reagan's drug campaign, and was unaware how easily criminals can buy guns.[37] In an interview with a pre-teen Quayle not only demonstrated a lack of understanding and compassion concerning abortion, but found it difficult to hold his own intellectually, with an eleven year old interviewer.[38]

In Columbia, South Carolina, he gave a big build-up for a speech closing in which he was going to share with the audience a profound and inspirational thought of his grandfather Eugene Pulliam: his inspirational thought was "This is the greatest country on earth because we are free."[39] In stage one, the campaign staff employed normal campaign message strategies: bolstering, attack and refutation messages to introduce the

candidate to the world. Evidently realizing the profound lack of judgment it was to have Quayle on the ticket, the staff embarked upon phase two which was to treat Quayle's scandals with basic elements of rhetorical apologia such as: denial, bolstering, differentiation, transcendence and minimization. [40]

In an attempt to minimize the problem, Bush declared the controversy was nothing but a "tempest in a teapot."[41]

Denying that Quayle was an albatross, handler Ken Khachigian (assigned to Quayle as his speechwriter), stated, "He's doing well and gaining confidence every day."[42]

Using the bolstering strategy to improve public confidence in Quayle, Stuart Spencer, head of the traveling Quayle team, said, "He's beginning to find a vocabulary and a rhythm that's comfortable to him."[43]

Denying he made a mistake, George Bush claimed his choice "is a statement of confidence in a younger generation." This is also a bolstering statement, serving to raise hopes for Quayle and reframe public sentiment. Using the tactic of differentiation Bush said, "Quayle means a whole new generation will be represented on the national scene."[44]

Quayle first defended himself with the strategy of denial. He received a standing ovation August 22 in Chicago after reiterating his assertion that he received no special treatment in joining the National Guard.[45] Transcending, Quayle argued:

> Let's put yesterday's news behind us. It is now time to focus on the real issues of the campaign. Not what Dan Quayle did 20 years in the past, but what President Bush or President Dukakis will do in the future to secure world peace.[46]

Trying further to refocus attention (transcendence), Quayle appealed to voters to continue a strong United States defense policy.[47] Employing humor to enhance credibility through likability he "drew appreciative comments" when he told the banquet guests, "After the last 72 hours, nobody can say I never faced combat."[48]

In St. Louis Quayle spoke to a sympathetic audience of former and current National Guard enlisted personnel that gave him several standing ovations, bolstering his morale, the campaign team's morale and his image. Careful choice of easy audiences became the rule from August 24 to the day of the election.[49]

Trying to do the work frequently assigned to Vice Presidential candidates,"pit-bull"[50] for the Presidential nominee, Quayle began making negative comments about "Liberal" Dukakis. The hope was to transcend Quayle's military career and to Quayle as a sharpshooter/pointperson. His handlers had him saying such things as "The roll-call of Michael Dukakis's defense land foreign policy positions amount to a litany of retreat, a prescription for American retrenchment." He further held "[Dukakis] is the man who described our liberation of Grenada as reckless foreigh policy and a misuse of power."[51] He additionally argued, "The Dukakis defense policies are a replay of the McGovern-Carter-Mondale far left." His emphasis on Dukakis as "far left" continued for the rest of the campaign. It was hoped Quayle could function as a label caster, issue-switcher, baiter and negative pundit maker. In Knoxville, Tennessee, on September 19, he made multiple attacks against Dukakis.[52]

Still trying to distance in his St. Louis speeches, Quayle made frequent references to his children. Since children are a popular image, this tactic served to refocus attention to the future and away from the current quagmire.[53] In Ohio, Kentucky, and Missouri he continued to try to

transcend his life twenty years ago and focus on what America should do ten years from now.[54]

In Indianapolis, Quayle continued to defend his choice of the Guard based on his claim that there were vacancies at the time he applied. He tried to divert attention away from his record by media bashing, comparing the press to sharks in a feeding frenzy, thereby engaging in denial (of family influence/privilege), diversion, and differentiation (their were vacancies).[55]

In the debate with Senator Bentsen, Quayle committed the campaign's super-blunder. His handlers hoped to improve Quayle's image by capitalizing on that of John F. Kennedy's. Utilizing the fact they both were young, nice-looking, wealthy, and served two terms in the Senate, Quayle, hoping to wear the JFK personna, compared himself to President Kennedy. Bentsen roughly rebuffed him: "Senator I served with Jack Kennedy. I knew Jack Kennedy. Jack Kennedy was a friend of mine. Senator, you're no Jack Kennedy."[56] Quayle seemed stunned.[57] After a long pause he responded, "That was really uncalled for, Senator." To which Bentsen replied:

> You're the one that was making the comparison, Senator, and I'm the one who knew him well, and frankly, I think you're so far apart in the objective you'd chose for your country, that I did not think the comparison was well taken.[58]

Bentsen's retort reaffirmed Quayle's political inexperience and emphasized that he was not yet ready for combat in the national political arena.[59]

The debate was criticized because Quayle's answers were scripted and unoriginal. The handler's had hoped to capture some of the Kennedy myth. The gaffe resonated across the nation. The Quayle team had hoped

to move an already secured audience,[60] one anchored in the opposing party, and failed miserably. In spite of Quayle's efforts at apologia, negative media attention continued anabated and Quayle continued to make repeated rhetorical blunders. Therefore, Quayle's handlers moved into a third phase, a public relations strategy to protect the ticket. At this juncture, the National Republican Party followed the time-honored football dictum: When all else fails, punt....

Powerless, lacking in moral and ethical force, Quayle became "the idea of the absent" similar to Foucault's disappearing subject.[61]

Quayle's handlers began to quarantine him from curious reporters. "When they yelled questions at him as he got off planes, he borrowed a page from President Reagan shrugging that he could not hear the questions over the noise of the engines."[62] His handlers began sending him to small towns, state fairs, and "audiences guaranteed to react favorably."[63] In the last weeks, when he should have been at the peak of his campaign, supporting Bush, attacking Dukakis, speaking to millions on television (like Senator Bentsen was doing), Quayle was hitting spots in high schools (non-voters). His role was clearly that of "phantom."[64] He complained outside a Columbus, Ohio, high school, "I wish I knew what my schedule was going to be. Put me on the air. I've been trying to create news for the last three weeks."[65]

The Bush-Quayle ticket was represented on the national level by Bush, by Bush's wife, Barbara, and two of their children, Jeb and Dorothy. To lessen the drag of Quayle on the ticket Mr. Bush's aides "employed a simple strategy: act as if Quayle did not exist."

"The Democrats want to make Quayle the major issue, but they can't find him ....He's under house arrest, " said Richard Viguerie, noted

conservative political consultant.[66] Jeff Fishel, a government professor at The American University observed, "The Republicans motives are obvious: 'Out of sight, out of mind'....[67]

Bush stumped with him only twice. Quayle made no major speeches after the convention. His name was dropped off bumper stickers by the Bush headquarters. The most attention Quayle got in the whole campaign was from Dukakis and Bentsen.[68] Quayle became the first Vice Presidential candidate to be gracefully removed from the ticket without being removed. He disappeared by simply melting away. He vanished. Poof.

NOTES

[1]Halford Ross Ryan, Oratorical Encounters: Selected Studies and Sources of Twentieth Century Accusations and Apologies (New York: Greenwood Press, 1986) xvii-xviii.

[2]Ernest G. Bormann, "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: The Rhetorical Criticism of Social Reality, " Quarterly Journal of Speech, 58 (1972) 396-407; and "Fantasy and Rhetorical Vision: Ten Years Later," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 68 (1982) 288-305. When the public heard the story about Dan Quayle's military record, it was consistent with orther stories of "rich kids" who successfully avoided active combat during war times. Because the story is a familiar one, it is believable. People began to emotionally respond to the story, extending the meaning and sharing the message with friends, polishing and embellishing the story way beyond the one article they may have read or the news report they may have heard. This extension is called chaining out. It is based partly on fact, partly on fiction and is described as a fantasy chain.

[3]Staff Reporters, "Excerpts from Questioning of Quayle About Guard Role in Vietnam War," New York Times, August 20, 1988.

[4]Maureen Dowd, "Hometown Crowd Turns Tables on Press for Questioning Quayle," New York Times, August 20, 1988, L9.

[5]The authors are indebted to Craig Allen Smith for his provocative paper, "Political Scandal and Narrative Rationality: The Tests of Accusation," presented at the 1988 Annual Speech Communication Association in New Orleans, November 4, 1988, p.3.

[6]Ibid. Pp. 7-12.

[7]Ibid. P. 14.

[8]Lisa Belkin, "Quayle's No. 1 Colleague Hits the Campaign Trail, " New York Times, Sunday, September 11, l988, p. 32. See also Staff Reporters, "Reading the Signs of Quayle Campaign, " New York Times, September 30, 1988.

[9]Mark Miller, "The Political Specter of Vietnam, " Newsweek, August 29, 1988, Pp. 27-28.

[10]Ibid., P. 28.

[11]Ibid., P. 28.

[12]Congressional Quarterly Weekly Report, "GOP Ticket Meets Press: Is Quayle Qualified?" Vol. 46, No. 34: Pp. 2358-2361. This quotation is taken from the test of the press conference held by the Republican ticket at 12 noon E.S.T. , on August 17. The test was transmitted by the Associated Press. Presidential nominee George Bush and Vice Presidential running mate, Senator Quayle, were asked questions about Quayle's qualifications to run for Vice President.

[13]Jacob V. Lamar, "Greetings You Have Been Selected, " Time (August 29, 1988) p. 23.

[14]Walter Shapiro, "The Quayle Quagmire," Time (August 29, 1988) P. 19.

[15]Ibid. P. 16.

[16]Ibid. P. 20.

[17]Anthony Lewis, "Quayle: The Real Issue," New York Times, (August 25, 1988).

[18] Ibid.

[19]Anthony Lewis, "What Is Quayle Hiding?" New York Times (September 15, 1988).

[20]Ibid.

[21]Ibid.

[22]Ibid.

[23]op cit., Shapiro, P. 22.

[24]Staff Reporters, "World of Advantage a Sturdy Ladder for Quayle to Climb to Success," New York Times (August 26, 1988) D16.

[25]op cit., Shapiro, P. 21.

[26]Tom Wicker, "Fit to Be President?" New York Times (August 24, 1988).

[27]op cit., Shapiro, P. 22.

[28]Maureen Dowd, "Quayle Makes Case in 'Show Me' State," New York Times (August 25, 1988) D16.

[29]Ibid.

[30]Ibid.

[31]Ibid.

[32]op cit., Staff Reporters, "World of Advantage a Sturdy Ladder...." New York Times (August 26, 1988) D16.

[33]Gerald M. Boyd, "Question of Selection, " New York Times, August 29, 1988, P. A14.

[34]Michael Pfau and Michael Burgoon, "Inoculation in Political Campaign Communication," Human Communication Research, Vol. 15, No. 1, Fall 1988, Pp. 91-111.

[35]Lisa Belkin, "Quayle Discards His Script on Military Issues and Raises Eyebrows," New York Times, September 9, 1988, P. A14.

[36]Jeffrey Schmalz, "Quayle is Critical of the State Department: Nominee Says 'Bureacracy" Impedes Development of Farm Exports," New York Times, September 4, 1988.

[37]Ibid. Also op cit., Lewis, New York Times, September 15, 1988.

[38]This ill-fated interview was shown several times. It was aired either in excerpt form, or in its entirety, on PBS, ABC, and Nickelodeon.

[39]David S. Broder, "Rookie Quayle Heeds Advice From Coaches," Washington Post, September 4, 1988.

[40]For a reasonably thorough treatment of rhetorical apologia, see: Jackson Harrell and Wil A. Linkugel "An Organizing Perspective," Philosophy and Rhetoric, 11 (Fall 1978), 263-275. Sherry Devereaux Butler, "The Apologia, 1971 Genre," Southern Speech Journal, 37 (1972), 281-89. Robert L. King, "Transforming Scandal into Tragedy: A Rhetoric of Political Apology," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 71 (1985), 289-301. Noreen W. Kruse, "Motivational Factors in Non-Denial Apologia," Central States Speech Journal, 218 (1977), 13-23. Noreen W. Kruse, "The Scope of Apologetic Discourse: Establishing Generic Parameters, Southern Speech Communication Journal 46 (1981) 278-291. B. L. Ware and Wil Linkugel, "They Spoke in Defense of Themselves: On the Generic Criticism of Apologia," Quarterly Journal of Speech, 59 (1973) 273-83.

[41]E. J. Dionee, Jr., "Bush Struggling to Shed Questions on Quayle Service," New York Times, August 21, 1988.

[42]op cit., Broder.

[43]Ibid.

[44]op cit., Boyd, August 29, 1988, A14.

[45]William E. Schmidt, "Quayle Receives Standing Ovation," New York Times, August 23, 1988, P A16.

[46]Ibid.

[47]Ibid.

[48]Ibid.

[49]op cit.., Dowd, "Quayle Makes Case In 'Show Me' State, " New York Times, August 25, 1988, D16.

[50]C. I. Barrett, "Shifting Mist," Time (September, 1988) P. 20.

[51]op. cit., Dowd, August 25.

[52]B. Drummond Ayres, Jr., "Quayle Joins in the Attack," New York Times, September 19, 1988. Quayle attacked Dukakis's "liberalism," his proposed military programs to promote national security, environmental record, prison furlough program, tax rates, and general record as Governor of Massachussetts.

[53]op cit., Dowd, August 25.

[54]Ibid. Dowd.

[55]Albert Scardino, "Story on Quayle Is Local News For His Family's Papers and They Cover It," New York Times, August 28, 1988.

[56]Quotation taken from the Vice Presidential National Debate. Televised on October 4, 1988. See also, John Mashek and Kevin Sack, "You're No Jack Kennedy Bentsen Lectures Quayle," The Atlanta Constitution, October 6, 1988, Front Page.

[57]Quayle was stunned. Subsequently, he admitted that he was "taken aback" by the exchange. See interview by Charlie Gibson with Dan and Marilyn Quayle broadcast on ABC's Good Morning America, January, 18, 1989.

[58]National Debate, October 4, 1988 (ABC, NBC, CBS)

[59]op cit. Mashek and Sack.

[60]Barry Brummett, "Using Apocalyptic Discourse to Exploit Audience Commitments Through 'Transfer,' The Southern Communication Journal, 54 (Fall, 1988) 58-73.

[61]Michel Foucault, The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences (1973) New York: Vintage Books, Pp. xv-xxiii. Quayle became the idea of the absent similar to Foucault's disappearing subject. Foucault

speaks of the "biological organism known as Derrida" or "the matrix of voices that we have chosen to call William Shakespeare " or "the sounds we attributed to the creature conventionally called 'Taine'" or" the anecdotal Voltaire" or "the objects said to be produced by the person who called himself Stendahl." Quoted in Andrew King's paper "Ethical Considerations in the Language of Political Advertising," presented at the Seventy-Fourth Annual Convention of the Speech Communication Association in New Orleans, 1988.

[62]op cit., Staff Reporters, New York Times, Auigust 26, 1988, D16. Also, op cit., Dowd, New York Times, August 25, 1988.

[63]Maureen Dowd, "Quayle Struggles to Put Confident Face on Drive," New York Times, August 27, 1988.

[64]Richard L. Berke, "Quayle Role As Phantom of Campaign," New York Times, November 6, 1988.

[65]Staff Reporters, "Campaign Trail-Quayle's Lament: Where to Now?" New York Times, November 2, 1988, A22.

[66]op cit., Berke.

[67]Ibid.

[68]Ibid.